

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37 and 39-43 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 28 and 35 being independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested in view of the following comments of the Applicants, which are preceded by related comments of the Examiner in small bold type:

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner states:

**Claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant.**

**Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al. teach all the limitations of the claims except for a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge. However, Deavila discloses an emergency station 20 having a portable fire extinguisher 102, a portable defibrillator located compartments 94c and 94d (see page 4, paragraph 0056). Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge 80 for detecting and displaying pressure condition within a volume of a tank 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Morgan et al. and Nishimoto et al. with a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge as suggested by Deavila and Avant respectively. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station.**

Applicant does not concede the Examiner's position with respect to any of these claims. However, in order to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 28 and 35 along with claims 8, 30-34, 36, 37 and 39- 43. Applicant contends that Morgan, Nishimoto, Deavila and Avant, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of the independent claims, as amended.

#### Claim 1

Morgan, Nishimoto, Avant and Deavila, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a communication between a detector and a remote central station to include a second emergency equipment station, in a system of emergency equipment stations, configured to pass

signals between at least the detector and the remote central station, as recited in independent claim 1. Each of Nishimoto, Avant and Deavila discloses stand alone devices and therefore fails to even suggest, much less disclose a communication between a detector and a remote central station to include passing a signal through a second emergency equipment station in a system of emergency equipment stations. Applicant contends that Morgan, which is directed to multiple external defibrillators connected via a communications network, also does not disclose or suggest the foregoing feature of independent claim 1. Rather, the defibrillator stations in Morgan are directly connected to a communication station via dedicated defibrillator communicators<sup>1</sup>. As described by Morgan:

The initial step of deploying the defibrillator is a triggering event that establishes a communication link between the defibrillator communicator 14 and the communication station 24 at an emergency medical care facility. Information thereafter begins to flow between the defibrillator communicator and the communication station.<sup>2</sup>

The defibrillator communicators in Morgan are merely communication links such as modems and are not examples of emergency equipment stations. Each defibrillator communicator is dedicated to serve a respective defibrillator station to communicate with the communication station. As described by Morgan:

Defibrillator communicator 14 therefore includes a telephone modem for sending and/or receiving data from the telephone lines and possibly a cellular telephone link (not shown). Communication station 24 would also include a modem for sending and/or receiving data to and from the defibrillator communicator via the telephone lines<sup>3</sup>. . . .

In addition, a plurality of other defibrillators, shown as elements 10' and 10", may be connected to the communication network as well through their respective defibrillator communicators 14' and 14".<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, Morgan does not even suggest, much less disclose a communication between a detector and a remote central station to include a second emergency equipment station, in a system of emergency equipment stations, configured to pass signals between at least the detector

---

<sup>1</sup> Morgan, Fig. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Morgan, Col. 4, lines 1-7.

<sup>3</sup> Morgan, Col. 3, lines 44-50.

<sup>4</sup> Morgan, Col. 3, lines 57-60.

and the remote central station. Independent claim 1 is believed to be patentable for at least the foregoing reasons. The dependent claims 6-8, 18-21 and 27 partake the novelty of claim 1. Therefore they are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 1 is patentable.

#### Claim 28

Applicant has amended independent claim 28 to include subject matter that is similar to independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 28 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 1 is patentable.

The dependent claims 30-32 and 40-43 partake the novelty of claim 28. Therefore they are also believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 28 is patentable.

#### Claim 35

The Examiner states:

**Claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant.**

Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge. However, Deavila discloses an emergency station 20 having a portable fire extinguisher 102, a portable defibrillator located compartments 94c and 94d (see page 4, paragraph 0056). Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge 80 for detecting and displaying pressure condition within a volume of a tank 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Cronin et al. and Nishimoto et al. with a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge as suggested by Deavila and Avant respectively. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station.

The Applicant contends that Cronin, Nishimoto, Deavila and Avant, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 35, as amended. As with Nishimoto, Deavila and Avant, Cronin is also directed to a stand alone device and therefore fails to even suggest, much less disclose a communication between a detector and a remote central station to include passing a signal through a second emergency equipment station in a system of emergency equipment stations. Therefore, these references, alone or in

combination, fail to disclose or suggest a communication between the detector and the remote station to include a second emergency equipment station in a system of emergency equipment stations configured to pass signals between at least the detector and the remote station.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 35 is believed to be patentable.

#### Dependent claims

The Examiner states:

Claims 9, 10, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 above, and further in view of Rockwell et al.

Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 above, and further in view of Cronin et al.

Claims 36, 37, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of Morgan et al.

All dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claim on which they depend on is patentable.

#### Double Patenting

The Examiner states:

Claims 1, 6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37, 39-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent No. 7,271,704 in view of Deavila and Avant.

Applicant will consider filing a terminal disclaimer upon the removal of the pending claim rejections and identification of allowable subject matter.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

Applicant : John J. McSheffrey et al.  
Serial No. : 10/614,948  
Filed : July 8, 2003  
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 04373-0033001


an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 22 December 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey J. Barclay  
Reg. No. 48,950

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

22056460.doc